

## REMARKS

Claims 9-15 are pending in the application and claims 1-8 and 16-17 have been withdrawn in view of the restriction requirement.

Claims 9-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,108 to Izumi et al. in view of Masayuki et al. (JP 10193242).

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that claims 12, 14 and 15 comprise allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten as suggested in the Office Action. By the above amendment, claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of base claim 9. As such, claims 12-15 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 9-11 and respectfully contend that at the very minimum, the combination of Izumi and Masayuki is legally deficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 9. For instance, on page 3 of the Office Action, Examiner essentially contends that Izumi discloses the following elements of claim 9:

*A method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display panel having a pair of substrates disposed oppositely to each other with a predetermined distance and secured by sealant formed along a peripheral portion thereof, and liquid crystal sealed in a region inside said sealant between said pair of substrates, comprising the steps of:*

- (a) flatly supporting one of said pair of substrates;*
- (b) dropping liquid crystal onto said one substrate;*
- (c) supporting the other of said pair of substrates so as to be bent by supporting two opposing sides thereof, and a bending amount is controlled to be a specified value;*

*(d) bringing said one substrate and the other substrate close to each other to reach a predetermined distance.*

Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's interpretation and characterization of Izumi with respect to these claim elements. For example, although Izumi arguably discloses (in FIGs. 4a-4d, and Col. 5, line 66 through Col. 6, line 12) an LCD panel (2) comprising a pair of glass substrates (4) and (5) that are bonded to each other via seal along the circumference of the substrates, with liquid crystal sealed airtight in a space between the substrates (4) and (5), there is nothing in Izumi that discloses or even remotely suggests a method for forming the LCD panel (2) as recited in claim 9.

For instance, Examiner contends on page 3 of the Office Action that Izumi discloses (in Fig. 4c and Col. 8, lines 59-68 and Col 13, lines 14-33) the steps of *(c) supporting the other of said pair of substrates so as to be bent by supporting two opposing sides thereof, and a bending amount is controlled to be a specified value and (d) bringing said one substrate and the other substrate close to each other to reach a predetermined distance*, as recited in claim 9.

However, there is nothing in either FIG. 4c (nor Fig. 4a, b or d) or the cited section (Col. 8, lines 59-68) that even remotely illustrates/describes one of the substrates (4) or (5) *being supported so as to be bent*.

To the extent that Examiner is relying on element (21) in Fig. 4c as illustrating a "bent" element, such reliance is misplaced as element 21 is a component of the pressing apparatus (20) (see, Col. 8, 59-61), but clearly not a substrate that forms an LCD panel. Further, Examiner's reliance and citation to elements 9, and 3a and 3b are irrelevant to the claimed invention.

Therefore, to the extent that Examiner relies on Izumi as disclosing the above elements, it is respectfully submitted that the combined teachings of Izumi and Masayuki as articulated in the Office Action fails to render claim 9 obvious since the combined teachings clearly do not disclose or suggest all the features of claim 9. Furthermore, claims 10 and 11 are patentable over such combination at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa

Registration No. 43,584

Mailing Address:

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
1900 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 501  
East Meadow, NY 11554  
TEL (516) 357-0091  
FAX (516) 357-0092